

8-16.05

[Handwritten signature]



PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: 007685/PMG/EPIC/JW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:) Group Art Unit: 2818
Judon Tony PAN) Examiner: Le, Dung Anh
)
)
Serial No.: 10/654,240) Election of Species in response to
Confirmation No.: 4883) Office Communication dated 5/19/05
Filed: 09/02/2003)
) PATENT COUNSEL
For: Bond Pad Techniques For Integrated) APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.
Circuits) Legal Affairs Department
) P.O. Box 450 A
) Santa Clara, CA 95052

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

ELECTION OF SPECIES

Applicant provisionally elects Group I, in response to the written restriction requirement dated May 19, 2005.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Patent and Trademark Office determined in a previous restriction requirement that claims 1-36 constitute a proper claim examination group under 35 U.S.C. §121, see Office Communication mailed on 08/26/2004. Applicant therefore believes that the present restriction requirement for claims 1-36 is improper.

Furthermore, the Patent and Trademark Office in its 08/26/2004 restriction requirement determined that claims 1-36 are all classified in one class, i.e. class 438, and in one subclass, i.e. subclass 672. As stated in the 08/26/2004 Office Communication: "Claims 1-36 drawn to [a] process of making a semiconductor device, classified in class 438 and subclass 672". In this context, applicant respectfully draws the Examiner's attention to MPEP §808.02 "**Related Inventions**", stating as follows.

Where, however, the classification is the same and the field of search is the same and there is no clear indication of separate future classification and field of search, no reasons exist for dividing among related inventions.


Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear from the 08/26/2004 classification determination regarding claims 1-36, when combined with MPEP §808.02, that "no reasons exist for dividing among" the inventions recited in claims

1-36. Applicant therefore believes that the present restriction requirement of claims 1-36 is improper.

Applicant respectfully traverses the present restriction requirement because applicant believes that the restriction of claims 1-36 in the 5/19/05 Office Communication is improper, as reasoned above.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 9, 2005

By: 
Albert J. Dalhuisen
Reg. No.: 36,117